

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated December 1, 2005

PATENT
450119-03:38

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present remarks are being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 12 and 14, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided at least at page 17 of the Specification as originally filed. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,601,041 to Brown, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Brown") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,346 to Frid-Nielsen, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Frid-Nielsen").

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Brown in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047298 to Moore, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Moore") and further in view of Frid Nielsen.

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated December 1, 2005

PATENT
450119-03 38

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“wherein the information processing apparatus calls and connects the information distributing means at a predetermined connection time, wherein the connection time is obtained by counting back from a display time” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Brown relates to prioritized queues of advertising and content data which are generated by a queue builder and sent to an on-line queue manager. A computer mediated communications network provides content and subscriber data to the queue builder and receives content segment play lists from the on-line queue manager.

As understood by Applicants, Frid-Nielsen relates to a method for reconciling two sets of information on an information processing system. The method includes loading both sets of data, detecting the current date, building a new list for each set of data, synchronizing the lists (typically, according to time), and displaying the synchronized lists.

Applicants submit that Brown, Moore and Frid-Nielson, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of wherein the connection time is obtained by counting back from a display time, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the Office Action relies on column 5, lines 9-39 of Frid-Nielson to teach or suggest that when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times. However, column 5, lines 9-39 of Frid-Nielson merely discloses transferring events from one list to another by selectively specifying the desired event and the direction of insertion. In a manner similar to that for reconciling scheduling information, the to-do lists of client areas may be reconciled by synchronizing corresponding due dates. Applicants submit that reconciling two schedules by

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated December 1, 2005

PATENT
450119-03138

building synchronized lists does not teach or suggest that when two or more display times overlap, the information provider adjusts a connection time zone to prevent overlap of two or more connection times.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 6, 12 and 14 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 14 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

U.S. Appln. No. 10/019,135
Response to Office Action dated December 1, 2005

PATENT
450119-03:38

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800